

REMARKS

Claims 1-51 were pending in this application.

Claims 1-6, 14-19, 27-32, 40-43, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Emens et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,591,279 ("Emens") in view of Serbinis et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,584,466 ("Serbinis").

Claims 46-49 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emens in view of Serbinis and in further view of Major et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,209,955 ("Major").

Claims 7-13, 20-26, 33-39, 44, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emens in view of Serbinis and in further view of Vaithilingam et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,411,724 ("Vaithilingam").

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, 11, 14, 23, 24, 27, 29, 33, 36, 37, 41, 45, and 46 to more particularly define the invention. Claims 7-9, 12, 13, 20-22, 25, 26, 33-35, 38, 39, 47, 50 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added by the amendments and the amendments are fully supported by the original specification.

The Rejection of Independent Claim 1, 14, and 27

The Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 14, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Emens in view of Serbinis.

Applicants' amended independent claims 1, 14, and 27 are, generally speaking, directed to a method and systems for providing remote access to captured content. Using a capture device, content regarding an event (e.g., detected by a sensor)

is captured and encapsulated with metadata that includes information about the capture device, the content, the event, and user information. The content encapsulated with metadata is transmitted to a remote computer over a communications network, where the metadata encapsulating the content is processed according to the information included in the metadata. The processing includes automatically associating the content with a user account, publishing the content to a database on the remote computer, generating a textual notification at the remote computer that includes information about the event, and transmitting the textual notification from the remote computer to a user associated with the account. The user may access the published content using a user access device.

Emens refers to a computer-based notification system. A user may define an event notification profile such that, when a sensor receives an indication that corresponds to those of the notification profile, a notification, including a digital image of the event, is sent to the user in an email.

Serbinis refers to an Internet-based document management system. An electronic document may be stored on an Internet-accessible server and accessed using a web browser, downloaded for review or manipulation, and then returned to the server for access by other users. The document management system may send authorized users notifications related to the documents stored on the server.

The Examiner concedes that Emens and Serbinis do not show or suggest encapsulating content with metadata and processing the metadata as specified by applicants' amended independent claims. Nonetheless, with reference to dependent claims 7-13, 20-26, 33-39, 44, and 49, the Examiner contends

that Vaithilingam teaches the use of meta-descriptors in the retrieval process of multimedia information.

Applicants submit, however, that the combination of Emens, Serbinis, and Vaithilingam does not show or suggest all of the elements of applicants' amended independent claims. In particular, the combination of these references does not show or suggest "processing the metadata encapsulating the content at the remote computer, wherein the processing comprises . . . [1] automatically associating the content with a user account . . . [2] automatically publishing the content on a remote computer . . . [3] automatically generating a textual notification at the remote computer" all according to the information included in the metadata. Instead, the meta-descriptors in Vaithilingam are only used enable searches for multimedia information to be done more quickly. The meta-descriptors in Vaithilingam therefore are not processed at a remote computer as specified by applicants' amended independent claims.

For at least this reason, applicants submit that the rejection of amended independent claims 1, 14, and 27 should be withdrawn.

The Rejection of Independent Claim 40

The Examiner rejected independent claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Emens in view of Serbinis.

Applicants' independent claim 40 is, generally speaking, directed to a method for providing remote access to captured content. Using a capture device, content regarding an event (e.g., detected by a sensor) is captured. In response to

receiving a user indication over a communications network to upload the content, the locally captured content is transmitted to a remote computer over a communications network, where the content is associated with a user account and is published to a database on the remote computer. The user is allowed to access the published content on the remote computer with a user access device.

The Examiner rejected independent claim 40 for the same reasons as independent claims 1, 14, and 27. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection.

In particular, neither Emens nor Serbinis show or suggest "receiving a user indication to upload [locally captured content] to a remote computer over a communications network," as specified by applicants' amended independent claim 40. In fact, Emens teaches away from this feature as Emens refers to a system that directly sends (i.e., via email) the content (i.e., a picture) for an event captured by a sensor directly to a user and without waiting for any user indication.

For at least this reason, applicants submit that the rejection of amended independent claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Emens in view of Serbinis should be withdrawn.

The Rejection of Independent Claim 46

The Examiner rejected independent claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Emens in view of Serbinis and Major.

Applicants' amended independent claim 46 is, generally speaking, directed to a method for providing remote access to captured content. Using a capture device, content regarding an

event (e.g., detected by a sensor) is captured and encapsulated with metadata that includes information about the capture device, the content, the event, and user information. The content encapsulated with metadata is transmitted to a remote computer over a communications network, where the metadata encapsulating the content is processed according to the information included in the metadata. The processing includes automatically associating the content with a user account, publishing the content to a database on the remote computer, determining a type of notification from a plurality of notification types, generating the notification at the remote computer that includes information about the event, and communicating from the remote computer the notification to a user using the determined type of notification. The user may access the published content using a user access device.

Major refers to a notification system for a mobile communication device that pushes user-selected data items from a host system to a user's mobile data communication device upon detecting the occurrence of one or more user-defined event triggers.

Applicants submit that, for at least the reasons provided above with respect to independent claims 1, 14, and 27, the combination of Emens, Serbinis, Vaithilingam, and Major does not show or suggest all of the elements of applicants' amended independent claim 46.

Furthermore, in spite of the Examiner's contention that the combination Emens and Serbinis with Major shows "allow[ing] the user to select the notification medium that best suit them," this combination does not show or suggest "determining at the remote computer a type of notification from

a plurality of notification types based on the information about the event included with the metadata" or "automatically generating the notification at the remote site . . . wherein the notification . . . includes the information about the event included with the metadata," as specified by applicants' amended independent claim 46. In contrast, Major merely redirects received data items instead of generating a notification at the remote site including information the event included with the metadata.

For at least these reasons, applicants submit that the rejection of amended independent claim 46 should be withdrawn.

The Rejection of the Dependent Claims

Applicants submit that the dependent claims 2-6, 10, 11, 15-19, 23, 24, 28-32, 36, 37, 41-45, 49, 49, and 51 are allowable at least because they depend, directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 14, 27, 40, and 46, respectively.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that this application, including claims 1-6, 10, 11, 14-19, 23, 24, 27-32, 36, 37, 40-46, 49, 49, and 51, is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Chasan/
Michael J. Chasan
Registration No. 54,026
Agent for Applicants

ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 1473
1211 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
Tel.: (212) 596-9000
Fax: (212) 596-9090